

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-3, 5-21 and 24-26 are allowable. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3 and 5-26 are pending in the application. Claim 22 has been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Claims 22-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,081,891 to Schermerhorn (hereinafter, "Schermerhorn") in view of JP Patent No. 11-231829 to Kenji (hereinafter, "Kenji"). In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Claim 22

With regard to independent claim 22, while Applicant respectfully submits that Schermerhorn and Kenji, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's invention as set forth in independent claim 22 as previously presented, Applicant currently amends claim 22 to more clearly distinguish some of the difference over the prior art of record and to help expedite prosecution and allowance of this claim. In view of the following comments, it is respectfully submitted that Schermerhorn and Kenji, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 22, for at least the following reasons.

On page 14 of the May 17, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicant agrees that Schermerhorn "does not teach a single sided driver" that "establishes a

current flow path to generate reset voltage waveforms that are supplied to both X and Y axes electrodes to eliminate wall charges in the display panel during a reset period," that "establishes a current flow path to generate address discharging voltage waveforms to be supplied to the X and Y axes electrodes to generate wall charges in the display panel during an address period," that "establishes charging/discharging paths to charge/discharge the display panel according to the predetermined switching sequences to drive the display panel during a sustain discharge period," and that "establishes a current flow path to generate the reset voltage waveform and the address discharging voltage waveforms during the reset period and the address period, respectively."

Applicant's independent claim 22 presently recites, among other things, "establishing a current flow path to generate reset ramp voltage waveforms for the X and Y axes electrodes to reduce wall charges on the display panel while cutting off the energy recovery path during a reset period," "establishing a current flow path to generate voltage waveforms for the X and Y axes electrodes to make wall charges on the display panel during an address period," "switching current between current flow paths to generate predetermined driving voltage waveforms alternating in polarity with respect to a reference voltage across X and Y axes electrodes according to predetermined switching sequences to drive the display panel during a sustain discharge period," and "establishing predetermined current flow paths to generate a reset voltage waveform and an address discharge voltage waveform during the reset period and the address period" which are identified by the Examiner in the above-quoted passage that Schermerhorn "does not teach." In at least the Office Action of December 16, 2008, the Examiner does not describe that Kenji, or any other prior art reference of record, teaches or suggests at least these features. Applicant respectfully submits that Schermerhorn and Kenji, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each of the features recited in independent claim 22.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claim 23

With regard to claim 23, it is respectfully requested that for at least the reason that this

Serial No.: 10/826,278
Docket No.: 101-1025
Amendment dated June 16, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of March 27, 2009

claim depends from amended independent claim 22, and therefore contains each of the features as recited in claim 22, claim 23 is also patentable over Schmerhorn and Kenji, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Examiner's Response to Arguments

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Applicant's arguments filed 03/11/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive." In the Remarks above, Applicants address the Examiner's Response to Arguments recited on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, as well as the rejections recited on pages 3-6 of the Office Action.

Reconsideration of claims 22 and 23 in view of the above Remarks is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.


Serial No.: 10/826,278
Docket No.: 101-1025
Amendment dated June 16, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of March 27, 2009

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: June 16, 2009
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Kevin T. Roddy
Registration No. 50,577